

Remarks/Arguments

Responsive to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action claims 12-18, 30-36 and 38 have been cancelled. In taking this action, applicants do so without prejudice and reserve the right to file a divisional application under 35 U.S.C. 121 containing those claims.

Responsive to paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action, claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 21, 23, 25, 26 and 29 have been amended to resolve the dependency issues, and claim 37 has been cancelled.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 19-21, 24 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Ballinger in view of Dempsey et al. is respectfully requested for the following reasons. Applicants assume that the rejection is based on Ballinger and Dempsey et al, even though Rukavina is mentioned in the first sentence of paragraph 7 of the Office Action, because Dempsey et al. is referred to in the remainder of paragraph 7 and Rukavina is identified in paragraph 8 as prior art not relied upon.

The teaching of Dempsey is significantly different as compared to applicant's invention. Dempsey teaches a simple switch-type mechanism for reversing the cutting blade from the workpiece if, during cutting, the load applied to the drive motor reaches a predetermined threshold. As described in the sentence beginning at column 1, line 65 of the Dempsey et al. patent, and again in the second paragraph of column 3, once the threshold is reached, the direction of the drive motor is reversed "at full speed" to "pull the saw blade out of the

work". Once pulled out of the work, the drive motor is switched back to advance the saw blade to the workpiece once more, but at a "limited speed for a predetermined period" to "avoid slamming the blade into the work". Once the predetermined period has passed, the saw continues to advance at normal speed, unless of course the threshold load is reached once again. Dempsey therefore teaches three movements of the drive motor: normal forward cutting speed; reverse speed; and a slower return speed, where reaching the overload threshold only has the effect of switching the drive motor to the reverse mode.

Claim 1 of the instant application, on the other hand, defines means for controlling the *rate of the advancing* movement of an abrasive wheel depending on the magnitude of the load applied to the wheel during abrasion. The realization of this feature is described, for example, in paragraph 0088 of the published specification. In this paragraph it is described that once a threshold load is reached, the rate of feed of the abrading wheel towards the workpiece is reduced. If, after reduction of the advancing rate the threshold is again reached, the advance rate is reduced further. As discussed above, Dempsey's solution to the problem of overload is to simply reverse the tool out of the workpiece at full speed. Dempsey in no way anticipates nor suggests controlling the advancing rate depending on the magnitude of the applied load, as is claimed in applicants' claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that one skilled in the art could not have been expected to arrive at the present invention on reading of Ballinger (which makes no mention of overload) in view of Dempsey et al. Claim 1 and its dependent claims are therefore considered as involving


an inventive step. As claim 19 corresponds to claim 1, claim 19 and its dependent claims are also considered as involving an inventive step.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 6, 19-21 and 24 are believed to patentably distinguish over Ballinger and Dempsey et al. within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Favorable action on this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

HODGSON RUSS LLP

By 
Martin G. Linihan
Reg. No. 24,926

One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, New York 14203-2391
Tel: (716) 848-1367
Dated: November 3, 2003